

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	D.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,225		12/01/2003	David Moy	100647-03390CONT	2106
31013	7590	08/09/2005		EXAMINER	
		NAFTALIS & FI	HENDRICKSON, STUART L		
	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YO	RK, NY	10036		1754	
				DATE MAILED: 08/09/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	10/725,225	MOY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stuart Hendrickson	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thi period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) □	23 May 2005. This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39 and 40 is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	withdrawn from consideration	<b>).</b>	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the c	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for the application from the International B	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have beer ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	
S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Off	ice Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 08042005	;

Application/Control Number: 10/725,225

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-8, 25, 28-36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Zhou et al article.

Zhou teaches, especially on pg. 234, making SiC nanofibers by contacting carbon nanotubes with vaporized SiO. The figures show tangled, uniform, unfused tubes. Beta is taught on pg. 237. It is noted that claim 38 is merely a recitation of intended use and does not require any additional material; if amended to do so, it will be further restricted as a composition.

Claims 1-8, 25-36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Zhou et al article.

The reference does not teach the identical verbiage, nor the exact process parameters. However, no difference is seen due to the similarity of the product description to what is claimed.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou taken with Nadkarni et al. 4915924 and Tennent 4663230.

Zhou differs in not teaching the temperature used, however Nadkarni teaches in columns 7 and 10 that essentially the same reaction may be performed at the claimed temperatures.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the temperatures of Nadkarni in the process of Zhou because doing so saves energy by requiring less heat.

Concerning claims 9 and 37, the product will be the same since the temperatures are the same. In so far as the carbon fiber starting material is not identically described by Nadkarni and Zhou- and differs from what is claimed- then it is noted that Tennent teaches the claimed fiber. Using it in the above process is an obvious expedient to provide the carbon fiber required in the above references.

Claims 10-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-14 and 17-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6841508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the dependent claims explicitly recite Si and the independent claims patented encompass the presently claimed conditions.

Applicant's arguments filed 5/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claims are not limited to the elected specie. Claim 10 should be 'currently amended'. Fig. 5a of Zhou shows the claimed diameter. It is combinable with Nadkarni, who teaches the claimed temperatures, because the same reaction is performed. The fact that the references perform the reaction is proof that the reaction does indeed occur. It is not necessary for Nadkarni to teach nanotubes because Zhou already does, and the arguments overlook the fact that it is the temperature which is relied upon. Nadkarni does not require a catalyst, so it is not contrary to Zhou. The use of a catalyst- lower temperature of reaction- has a downside of being an impurity; this is simply an obvious tradeoff given what the references teach.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754